

Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development
US 90 (FUTURE I-49)
LA 318 INTERCHANGE
DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT
STATE PROJECT NO. H.004932/FEDERAL PROJECT NO. H004932

DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
RESPONSES TO PROPOSER COMMENTS

Part and Section Number	Proposer Comment	Department Response
	For the convenience of the Proposers please consider issuing an unofficial “track changes” version of the Final RFP.	No change.
Instructions to Proposers (ITP), Appendix A – Technical Proposal Instructions	Appendix A in the DRAFT RFP only contains the cover page. Will the LA DOTD be providing Appendix A during the draft RFP stage?	No change. Link to updated Draft Request for Proposals (RFP) sent on November 12, 2014.
ITP Section 1.7	The Anticipated Proposal Schedule provides three weeks between the issuance of the Final RFP and the date for one-on-one meetings regarding ATCs. If the Draft RFP had included a traditional schematic containing an actual ROW survey, three weeks is adequate because Proposer’s could start on developing ATCs now. As it is, Proposers don’t know if ROW information will be issued with the Final RFP. We are reluctant to invest great effort gathering our own ROW data if LA DOTD intends to provide it. If LA DOTD does not provide it with the Final RFP, three weeks will not be enough time to develop an assumed ROW and to adequately address ATCs. Five weeks is more desirable.	No change.

Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development
US 90 (FUTURE I-49)
LA 318 INTERCHANGE
DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT
STATE PROJECT NO. H.004932/FEDERAL PROJECT NO. H004932

DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
RESPONSES TO PROPOSER COMMENTS

Part and Section Number	Proposer Comment	Department Response
ITP Section 1.13 and Contract Documents, Part 3 – Design Requirements and Performance Specifications, Appendix A – Performance Specifications, Environmental Performance Specification Sections 1.0 and 4.2	<p>This section [ITP Section 1.13] says: “<i>This RFP is being issued concurrently with the LA DOTD's acquisition of all environmental permits...</i>”</p> <p>This section [Environmental Performance Specification Section 1.0] says: “<i>...the Design-Builder will be responsible for obtaining all environmental permits required for this Project.</i>”</p> <p>This section [Environmental Performance Specification Section 4.2] delineates responsibilities between LA DOTD and the Design Builder for specific permits.</p> <p>Please consider reconciling the language between these three sections.</p>	Change made.

Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development

**US 90 (FUTURE I-49)
LA 318 INTERCHANGE
DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT
STATE PROJECT NO. H.004932/FEDERAL PROJECT NO. H004932**

**DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
RESPONSES TO PROPOSER COMMENTS**

Part and Section Number	Proposer Comment	Department Response
ITP, Appendix B – Lump Sum Price Proposal Instructions Section B2.1.2(I)	Given (a) the lack of ROW information combined with (b) the magnitude of impacted properties, (c) the presence of an abandoned railroad, (d) Parish roads that could potentially reside on private property, and (e) the ROW Mapping effort for 160 properties (Title research, Property Surveys, Title Updates, Base ROW Map, Final ROW Map) the ROW Acquisition effort on the Project could take up to 18 months or more before a meaningful number of rights-of-entry are obtained. The Draft RFP's stipulated contract time of 1,100 days calculates to 36 months between NTP and Final Acceptance. Subtracting the lead time to obtain ROW as well as an optimistic four month period between Substantial Completion and Final Acceptance, a mere 14 months remains to finalize design and to build the project. Please consider the impact that the ROW acquisition process will have on the Project Schedule and consider relieving the Design-Builder of some or all of the risk associated with the ROW acquisition time frame.	No change.

Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development

**US 90 (FUTURE I-49)
LA 318 INTERCHANGE
DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT
STATE PROJECT NO. H.004932/FEDERAL PROJECT NO. H004932**

**DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
RESPONSES TO PROPOSER COMMENTS**

Part and Section Number	Proposer Comment	Department Response
Contract Documents, Part 1 – Design-Build (DB) Agreement, Appendix A – Project Scope Sections 2.1 and 3.0(A)(I)	The Project limits defined in section 2.1 state the project will extend approximately 6,000 feet northwest to approximately 3,000 feet southeast of the existing LA 318 intersection. The Pavement Construction defined in 3.0.A.1 states the northerly terminus shall begin approximately 3,000 feet northwest of the LA 318 intersection. These 2 sections seem to conflict the northwest limits, can the Department please clarify which one is accurate?	No change.

Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development
US 90 (FUTURE I-49)
LA 318 INTERCHANGE
DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT
STATE PROJECT NO. H.004932/FEDERAL PROJECT NO. H004932

DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
RESPONSES TO PROPOSER COMMENTS

Part and Section Number	Proposer Comment	Department Response
Contract Documents, Part 1 – DB Agreement, Appendix A – Project Scope, Section 2.2 and Part 3 – Design Requirements and Performance Specifications, Appendix A – Performance Specifications, Roadway Geometrics Performance Specification, Section 2.0	Both RC-2 & RC-3 Guidelines referenced for LA 318 & frontage roads/local roads. Please clarify which roadway classification should be used for each.	Change made.

Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development

US 90 (FUTURE I-49)
LA 318 INTERCHANGE
DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT
STATE PROJECT NO. H.004932/FEDERAL PROJECT NO. H004932

DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
RESPONSES TO PROPOSER COMMENTS

Part and Section Number	Proposer Comment	Department Response
Contract Documents, Part 1 – DB Agreement, Appendix A – Project Scope, Section 2.2(B) and Part 3 – Design Requirements and Performance Specifications, Appendix A – Performance Specifications, Roadway Geometrics Performance Specification, Section 2.0(A)	<p>In Part 1 it says: <i>“Reconstruction and widening of LA 318 to a two-way, two-lane roadway with median and shoulders (RC-2 roadway classification)”</i>;</p> <p>In Part 3 it says: <i>“A) For US 90 (Future I-49) and LA 318 interchange, frontage roads and related features shall be designed and constructed to meet or exceed LA DOTD F-3 Design Guidelines for US 90, LA DOTD RC-3 Design Guidelines for LA 318 and LA DOTD RC-2 Design Guidelines for frontage roads and local roads.”</i></p> <p>Please reconcile the two different design classifications for LA 318.</p>	Change made.
Contract Documents, Part 1 – DB Agreement, Appendix A – Project Scope Section 2.2(F)	Can DOTD provide specific information regarding localized drainage issues mentioned in Part I, Section 2.2F?	No change.

Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development

**US 90 (FUTURE I-49)
LA 318 INTERCHANGE
DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT
STATE PROJECT NO. H.004932/FEDERAL PROJECT NO. H004932**

**DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
RESPONSES TO PROPOSER COMMENTS**

Part and Section Number	Proposer Comment	Department Response
Contract Documents, Part 3 – Design Requirements and Performance Specifications, Appendix A – Performance Specifications	In the absence of a design requirement for it in Part 3, will the Final RFP include a performance specification for roadway lighting?	No change.
Contract Documents, Part 3 – Design Requirements and Performance Specifications, Appendix A – Performance Specifications, Maintenance of Traffic Performance Specification	Can DOTD provide the anticipated level of Traffic Management Plan (TMP) that will be required for this project?	No change.
Contract Documents, Part 3 – Design Requirements and Performance Specifications, Appendix A – Performance Specifications, Right-of-Way (ROW) Performance Specification	Will DOTD allow a field office for Real Estate?	No change.

Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development

**US 90 (FUTURE I-49)
LA 318 INTERCHANGE
DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT
STATE PROJECT NO. H.004932/FEDERAL PROJECT NO. H004932**

**DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
RESPONSES TO PROPOSER COMMENTS**

Part and Section Number	Proposer Comment	Department Response
Contract Documents, Part 3 – Design Requirements and Performance Specifications, Appendix A – Performance Specifications, Right-of-Way (ROW) Acquisition Performance Specification, Section 4.0	This section requires the Design-Builder to prepare and submit a ROW Acquisition Service Plan to LA DOTD within 30 days from NTP. This is half the time customarily afforded a Design Builder. Additionally, the ROW acquisition effort for the Project is significant, involving approximately 160 properties. Please consider increasing the timeframe to submit the plan that is more reflective of this Project's more complex ROW acquisition effort.	No change.
Contract Documents, Part 3 – Design Requirements and Performance Specifications, Appendix A – Performance Specifications, Right-of-Way Performance Specification Section 6.0(B)	The performance measures state that the Design-Builder's performance will be measured by the timeliness of acquisitions relative to the project's critical path. Is it the Department's intent for the ROW acquisition time to be included in the contract time? If so, would the Department consider a conditional NTP, to allow for the ROW acquisition, prior the the charging of contract time?	No change.

Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development
US 90 (FUTURE I-49)
LA 318 INTERCHANGE
DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT
STATE PROJECT NO. H.004932/FEDERAL PROJECT NO. H004932

DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
RESPONSES TO PROPOSER COMMENTS

Part and Section Number	Proposer Comment	Department Response
Contract Documents, Part 4 – RFP Plans, Paragraph 2.0	<p>This section states: <i>“The Project layout plan is categorized as directive for the project limits, the minimum clearances shown, number of mainline lanes to be provided and the locations where bridge structures are to be used. The Project layout plan is categorized as indicative in all other aspects.”</i></p> <p>The wording of this section indicates that all horizontal geometry inside the project limits is eligible for reconfiguration by the Design Builder.</p> <p>a) If this is not the intent please provide additional and more specific detail of features intended to be directive.</p> <p>b) To further the Proposers’ understanding of the mandatory geometric layout, and the precise limits of the existing and required Right-of-Way associated with project corridor’s directive limits please provide all CAD files for the Project Layout Plan.</p>	Change made.

Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development
US 90 (FUTURE I-49)
LA 318 INTERCHANGE
DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT
STATE PROJECT NO. H.004932/FEDERAL PROJECT NO. H004932

DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
RESPONSES TO PROPOSER COMMENTS

Part and Section Number	Proposer Comment	Department Response
Contract Documents, Part 5 – Engineering Data, Interchange for US 90 and LA 318 Environmental Assessment Finding of No Significant Impact	Can DOTD provide a CAD file along with Inroads alignment (.alg) files that has the alignments that are shown in the preferred Alternate E from the Environmental Assessment Report?	Change made.
Contract Documents, Part 5 – Engineering Data, Interchange for US 90 and LA 318 Environmental Assessment Finding of No Significant Impact, Table ES-1	Preferred Alternative E indicates a Right-of- Way (ROW) property value of \$4,164,000 (for which LA DOTD retains responsibility). a) Please consider including a provision in the Final RFP providing the Proposers the opportunity to adjust the Project’s new ROW, which would be intended to decrease the total project cost for LA DOTD. b) If a provision for adjusting the ROW is allowable, please include a means for scoring this benefit.	No change.

Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development
US 90 (FUTURE I-49)
LA 318 INTERCHANGE
DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT
STATE PROJECT NO. H.004932/FEDERAL PROJECT NO. H004932

DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
RESPONSES TO PROPOSER COMMENTS

Part and Section Number	Proposer Comment	Department Response
Contract Documents, Part 5 – Engineering Data, Topographic Survey	The Topographic Survey does not contain existing ROW nor private property lines. In the absence of this information, and as a practical matter, a Proposer’s preliminary design would need to be based upon assumed ROW derived from As-Built plans and Parish data. This would cause a Proposer’s preliminary design to be less precise in predicting the facility’s final features. As a consequence, a Proposer’s price would likely include a contingency to account for higher risk than is usual for a Design-Build project. Additionally, the final acreage of required property takings will not be established until after execution of the Design-Build Agreement.	No change.
Contract Documents, Part 5 – Engineering Data, Topographic Survey and Reference Documents, Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)	Will DOTD host a utility meeting with all utility companies so the prospective bidders can discuss locations of utilities that may not be in the existing topo survey or picked up by Cardno during the SUE services and discuss which utilities may have a higher relocation cost?	No change.

Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development

**US 90 (FUTURE I-49)
LA 318 INTERCHANGE
DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT
STATE PROJECT NO. H.004932/FEDERAL PROJECT NO. H004932**

**DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
RESPONSES TO PROPOSER COMMENTS**

Part and Section Number	Proposer Comment	Department Response
Reference Documents, SUE	Can DOTD provide CAD files for the SUE service drawings provided in the Draft RFP?	Change made.